



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,976	04/07/2006	Martin Graham Partridge	JMYS-141US	5934
23122	7590	09/29/2008		
RATNERPRESTIA				
P O BOX 980				
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980				
EXAMINER				
BOYKIN, TERRESSA M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/29/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/574,976

**Applicant(s)**

PARTRIDGE ET AL.

**Examiner**

Terressa M. Boykin

**Art Unit**

1796

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-22 and 24-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-22 and 24-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Response to Arguments**

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14 - 32 have been considered and are persuasive but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1-22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by see USPub 20020019564 (USP 7329778) see abstract, claims 7,11 and paragraphs below .**

**USPub 20020019564** discloses a process for making a salt of a carboxylic acid. The process comprises contacting a catalyst with an alkaline mixture comprising a primary alcohol.

In [0020], the catalyst comprises a metal sponge comprising at least about 15% by weight non-copper metal, and at least about 10% by weight copper. In a particularly preferred embodiment, the dehydrogenation catalyst further comprises less than about 1% by weight metal oxide. In yet another particularly preferred embodiment, the

dehydrogenation catalyst comprises greater than about 1% by weight nickel, tin, chromium, tungsten, titanium, niobium, tantalum, vanadium, molybdenum, manganese, bismuth, antimony, lead, germanium, or a combination thereof.

The reference also discloses that in [0059], other metals (e.g., zinc, cobalt, iron, and tin) which show some reactivity in alkaline and/or chelating environments also may often be suitable.

The reference also discloses that a chelating agent may also be beneficial to inhibit the displaced metal from redepositing onto the metal support. Suitable chelating agents include, for example, hydroxy carboxylic acids, (e.g., lactic acid, malic acid, citric acid, and tartaric acid) and salts thereof (e.g., sodium potassium tartrate, also described in the art as "Rochelle salt"), with tartaric acid and salts thereof being preferred.

With regard to claim 20 [0086] Suitable chelating agents include, for example, hydroxy carboxylic acids (e.g., lactic acid, malic acid, citric acid, and tartaric acid) and salts thereof .

With regard to claim 18 and 19 the reference states that the process comprises contacting a dehydrogenation catalyst with an alkaline mixture comprising a primary alcohol which may inherently be a diol as that which is claimed. The reference discloses a catalyst which is used in the esterification reaction prepared from the same components as claimed by applicants. Since the disclosed amounts, i.e. moles per mole..., are expressed differently and thus may be distinct from those claimed, it is incumbent upon applicant(s) to establish that they are in fact different and whether such difference is unobvious. Nevertheless with regard to the claims directed to the amounts,

the reference does disclose the amounts in [0105]. In view of the above, there appears to be no significant difference between the reference and that which is claimed by applicant(s). Any differences not specifically mentioned appear to be conventional. Consequently, the claimed invention cannot be deemed as novel and accordingly is unpatentable.

### **35 USC 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 26, 27, 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over see USPub 20020019564 abstract, claims.**

With regard to claims 28-32 the reference discloses the zinc moiety may be used but does not specify what type. However, zinc salts including zinc acetate are the common form of zinc that is used.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a zinc compound of those claimed since generally, it is prima facie obvious to select a known material for incorporation into a composition,

based on its recognized suitability for its intended purpose. See Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp., 325 US 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). See also In re Leshin, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960).

With regard to claims 26 and 27 the reference does not specifically disclose the use of terephthalate but the crux of the invention is the formation of a process for making a salt of a carboxylic acid which would include terephthalate. Thus since some portion of terephthalate would be produced during the reaction, some of the terephthalate would inherently be included there.

With regard to the amounts employed, since it is well-established that merely selecting proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing of criticality. In re Becket, 33 U.S.P.Q. 33 (C.C.P.A. 1937). In re Russell, 439 F.2d 1228, 169 U.S.P.Q. 426 (C.C.P.A. 1971).

### **Provisional Obviousness-type Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims of copending Application No. **10538341**; or claims of copending application **10537651**. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented. Each of the applications claims a catalyst suitable for use in an esterification reactions which may include the reactants and moieties as claimed by applicants it would have been obvious given the information in the claims to produce the catalyst as currently claimed..

### **Correspondence**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terressa M. Boykin whose telephone number is 571 272-1069. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 10-5:30 Friday (work at home).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Terressa M. Boykin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796